

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the final Office Action mailed on April 1, 2011.

The Examiner rejects claims 23-25, 27, 29, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gvozdanovic et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,660,720 in view of Seo, U.S. Patent No. 6,959,448, Gross, U.S. Patent No. 7,032,020, and in further view of Fang, U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2007/0064722. The Examiner rejected each of claims 28, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over respective combinations, each citing Gvozdanovic, Seo, Fang, and Gross, respectively. The Examiner rejected claims 35-37, 40, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gvozdanovic and Gross. The Examiner rejected claims 39, 41, 42, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over respective combinations, each including Gvozdanovic and Gross as the primary and secondary references, respectively.

Independent claim 23 has been amended to recite the limitations of “defining a second average rate to transmit a second plurality of packets of said data comprising a subset of said first plurality of packets, wherein said second plurality of packets is less than said first plurality of packets, wherein said second average rate is greater than said first average rate” and “a transmitter automatically increasing the rate of transmission to said receiver of said second plurality of packets over a wireless interconnection to said second average rate.” Independent claim 35 has been amended to recite the limitations of “defining a transmission rate to transmit a plurality of packets of said contiguous sequence wherein said transmission rate is greater than the average rate for transmitting said data to a receiver” and “transmitting said plurality of packets of said data over a wireless interconnection to a receiver, at a rate automatically increased to said second rate, wherein all packets contain at least one of audio data and video data.” The applicant believes that these amendments distinguish over the Examiner’s rejection.

Gross discloses a system that tests bandwidth between network segments using special “smart nodes” (SN) defined as “stand-alone boxes . . . added to the network system 100, being placed in-line between a hub and a network device.” See Gross at col. 4 lines 8-14. These smart nodes are linked to a central server and programmed to supply test packet profiles (defined as “one or more short packet bursts or one or more packet streams”) upon command of the server “to other select SN’s at precise times.” See *Id.* at col. 3 lines 43-44 and col. 4 lines 58-60. Gross clearly indicates that these test packets are not application data:

Traffic other than the test packet bursts used in the test should not be present during the test. Optionally, to avoid causing excessive disruption in normal network traffic, all burst traffic may be marked as high priority using the IP header TOS field for distinction, so that it gets preferred treatment. In that case, the only restriction is that *normal network traffic be confined to best effort*. However, *if it is determined that other traffic will not be present, i.e. there is no normal best effort traffic nor any high priority traffic, the packet burst traffic does not need to be marked as priority packets.*

Id. at col. 6 lines 8-19 (emphasis added).

Thus, Gross fails to teach modifying Gvozdanovic to transmit a subset of the larger set of voice data packets at a burst to measure bandwidth using only the burst of voice data. Gross merely teaches a smart node that sends additional test packets that measure bandwidth. This is a significant distinction because, as taught by Gvozdanovic, packets of voice data could not be sent in the bursts as taught by Gross. Specifically, Gvozdanovic teaches a shared network that sends both voice and data traffic, such as voice-over IP. Specifically, Gvozdanovic teaches that a voice application should enforce parameters, including a sustained cell rate and a peak cell rate (what the Examiner refers to as the claimed first and second average rates, respectively), because otherwise, disruptions in traffic would result from the variable bit rate caused by a voice application that suppresses silence so as to free up bandwidth rather than encode that silence. See Gvozdanovic at col. 5 lines 22-45; *Id.* at col. 1 lines 23-48. Essentially, to make the communication network for voice-over IP more efficient, silence is suppressed to free up

bandwidth, and the voice signal is “shaped” *down* to its peak cell rate to increase bandwidth for Internet data traffic. See Gvozdanovic at col. 6 lines 8-10. (“Traffic shaping may be required on an ATM VCC whenever an application is capable of producing short bursts of data at a short term rate significantly in excess of PCR.” Because silence is non-deterministic, however, unpredicted periods of continuous speech by multiple users can overload the network. See Gvozdanovic at col. 4 lines 33-39.

The defined maximum peak cell rate for individual applications, however, cannot be ordered by a central server. In other words, an inherent aspect of the disclosure of Gvozdanovic is that the network has no means to *drive* voice traffic to the peak cell rate, but can only enforce it as a limit when it is reached or exceeded by an application, i.e. a server has no means of forcing multiple persons to speak at once so as to attain the PCR. Yet, for the teachings of Gross to be used to estimate bandwidth from a voice signals deposited into the network at the peak cell rate, the network must be able to *cause* the test packets to be sent at a rate that overflows the capacity of a link. This is a fundamental incompatibility between Gross and the primary reference, Gvozdanovic.

The Examiner asserts that “Gvozdanovic already discloses both the sustained cell rate and the peak cell rate voice packets” and reasons that these packets may be used with the teachings of Gross to estimate bandwidth based on respective arrival times of only those packets transmitted at the peak cell rate of Gvozdanovic. This misses the point of the applicant’s argument which is that the disclosed peak cell rate disclosed by the prior art is a *limit enforced on a transmission rate*, and not a defined rate to *force transmission to*. The latter is what is claimed, and as noted earlier, Gvozdanovic cannot force transmission to the maximum limit automatically during a predefined test interval, required in the method of Gross. To the contrary, since the peak cell rate is intended as an upper limit, i.e. *something that should be avoided*, Gvozdanovic teaches *against* the limitation of “automatically increasing the rate of transmission to said receiver of said second plurality of packets . . . to said second average rate” as required by claim 23, for example.

For each of these reasons, claims 23 and 35, as well as their respective dependent claims 24, 25, 27-31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39-42, 44, and 45 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 23-25, 27-31, 33-37, and 39-45.


This Amendment is being submitted with a Request for Continued Examination, together with the requisite fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 03-1550.

Respectfully submitted,

CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, McCCLUNG & STENZEL

Dated: June 7, 2011

By



Kurt A. Rohlf, Reg. No. 54,405
601 SW Second Ave., Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204
Tel: (503) 227-5631